

**FIRST 5 - PLACER
CHILDREN and FAMILIES COMMISSION**
11820 Enterprise Dr.
Auburn, CA 95603

Meeting Minutes March 8, 2007

Attendees – Commissioners & Staff:

Catherine Goins, Vice-Chair, Commissioner, Childhood Development
Jim Holmes, Commissioner, Board of Supervisors, District #3
Richard J. Burton, M.D., M.P.H., Commissioner, Placer County Health Officer
Dayle Edgerton, RN, Commissioner, Child Health Care
Dr. Sandra Naylor-Goodwin, Chair-Commissioner, Children's Behavioral Health
Elaine Rowen, Ph.D., Commissioner, Early Education
Melanie M. Cleary, Commissioner, Lake Tahoe Area
Don Ferretti, First 5 Director
Christiana Darlington, Counsel
Nancy Baggett, Staff Support, Administration
Sandy Renz, Staff Support, Administration

Commissioners & Staff Not in Attendance:

Bob McDonald, Commissioner, Early Intervention
Kim Haswell, Commissioner, Consumer

Public Attendees:

Kelly Bennett Woffard – Placer CHI Project Consultant - Healthy Kids Healthy Futures
Heidi Kolbe, The Kolbe Company
Brad Morrison, Morrison Forbes
Cathy Ferron, Ferron & Associates
Vicky Pantels, UC Cooperative Extension UCCE

Call Meeting to Order

Meeting called to order at 4:40 p.m.

I. Public Comment

Persons may address the Commission on items not on this agenda. Please note that although the Commission is very interested in your concerns, the California Brown Act prohibits the Commission from taking any action this meeting on items not published on this agenda.

None

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes from January 11, 2007 meeting.

Rowen/Cleary Unanimous

III. Commission Action Items:

1. Public Hearing – State First 5 Annual Report – Fiscal Year 2005-06

In October 2006, First 5 Placer submitted its annual program report to the State First 5 Commission. The state compiles reports from all 58 First 5 Commissions' into one report and submits it to the state legislature. Each local First 5 Commission is required by law to hold a public hearing on the State First 5 Annual Report.

Action Requested:

- Allow for public comment and accept the report.

Discussion:

The complete State First 5 Annual Report was made available at the meeting. The Placer County section of this report was copied and sent as a part of the Commission packet. The report covers the period of July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

The highlighted programs section of the report is not meant to say that one program is more important than another. The state requires that we highlight school readiness programs, otherwise Stanford Research Institute (State evaluator) takes portions of the report we sent them in October and includes them in the state report as they see fit. Over the last five years we have used the state annual report to highlight most all of the programs funded by First 5 – Placer.

Motion to accept the State First 5 Annual Report

Goins/Cleary Unanimous

IV. Commission Discussion Items:

1. Currently First 5 Placer is contracting with four consultants to provide various services. This was an opportunity to hear updates from our consultants as follows:

- Brad Morrison – Staffing/Workload Study
- Cathy Ferron – Evaluation
- Kelly Bennett Woffard – Children's Health Initiative
- Heidi Kolbe – Application Review Committee

Discussion:

The consultants were asked not to bring presentations or written reports. This is an informal conversation that presented information verbally by bringing the Commission up to speed as to where they stand. Each consultant gave a brief update and was available for Q & A.

Brad Morrison – Staffing/Workload Study: He has completed all interviews with Placer County personnel and is currently interviewing First 5 Executive Directors in counties that receive a similar Prop 10 allocation to Placer. The goals of the staffing/workload study are to: 1) compare and contrast what other Commissions around the State are doing and; 2) determine the optimum staffing levels needed for

First 5 Placer as it implements its 2007-2010 Strategic Plan. The study will look at each of the current staffing positions and most likely make baseline comparisons of what services cost. We will also look at what these staffing services cost outside the County and determine what the Commission might expect to pay for some of those services. The Commission will have a lot of information that will help it with projecting operational costs with the focus being on a strategic level.

Cathy Ferron – Evaluator: She has been working as our independent evaluator for four months. She has been able to attend eight Learning Conversations. In regards to evaluation levels over the course of the year, we will be looking at program/client level outcomes, result area outcomes and community level outcomes. We want to identify: what differences we are making across the county; what is happening on a bigger picture?; look at trend data; where are we heading related to the specific programs?; and meet all state reporting requirements.

Kelly Bennet Woffard – CHI: The regional Children's Health Initiative involves Placer, Yuba, Colusa, El Dorado and Sacramento counties. We have just gotten started with our Placer CHI. We are tasked with creating a Children's Health Initiative that includes children 0-18 years of age. Kelly shares that she is reviewing outreach systems within Placer County that are already in place to enable people to utilize the established insurance programs. Funds currently exist through First 5 Placer for Placer outreach activities so we want to expand on that and take advantage of those funds. The Lincoln Lighthouse, North Tahoe Family Resource Center and the Child Abuse Prevention Council Family Resource Centers are some of the great resources that have some experience in enrollment setup. She plans to meet with these organizations to see where they are, if they have any funding and where they can fit into the Placer CHI.

On February 28th the first Placer CHI informational meeting took place. Thirty-one people attended that represented a broad spectrum of backgrounds. People explained that they are excited about getting involved in the CHI and providing coverage for kids.

Our next step is to establish, in Placer County, what is called the local program administrator (LPA). The LPA can be an entity or an individual that will actually do the enrollment for Healthy Kids. Someone has to deem children eligible and take care of the process involved with enrolling each child based on the guidelines set by the program.

With Placer County involved in the regional efforts, they do require that the Board of Supervisors, in this county, approve the regional Healthy Kids Healthy Futures charter and for one of the Board of Supervisors members, preferably Supervisor Jim Holmes, to serve on the regional board. There are actually three regional board seats: One is filled by Dayle Edgerton representing the Commission; one seat will represent the local CHI, and one seat is for the Board of Supervisors.

First 5 has the premiums for 0-5 mostly covered. There were questions concerning the amount of money needed per child to serve the 6-18 population. The amount of money that is needed is approximately \$1,100 per child. When you add in the cost of outreach and administration the amount needed in Placer to purchase insurance for 6-18 year old that do not qualify for Healthy Families or Medi-Cal is over \$ 700,000 annually. The plan is to raise money for at least fifty slots.

Don – First 5 – Placer is but one member of the local CHI. Even though we are providing the initial funding to support it, when the dust settles, we should be just one of many organizations on the CHI that is contributing to the overall goal of ensuring that all

children 0-18 in Placer County have health insurance and access to quality medical services.

Dayle –There was a regional HKHF board meeting today in Sacramento that she attended. She shared that from this meeting came a good picture where others have been and where we will be. Things are under way and being structured.

It was noted that Dayle's participation on the regional board is very much appreciated.

Dr. Burton – Commented that he attended the CHI February meeting and thought it was a great meeting. He wanted the Commission to know that there was probably half a dozen HHS staff members meeting trying figure out how they can best fit into the CHI. With the timeline of having a program operational by July 1st., HHS probably would be more effective in supporting the coalition if we knew more precisely what HHS expertise would be most beneficial to the CHI. There needs to be a local discussion concerning prioritization and access to the insurance slots. He expressed that he looks forward to working with the local CHI.

Heidi Kolbe – Facilitator/Recorder Team: It is very exciting to be a part of the activities to bring to life the Strategic Plan that the Commission worked so hard to complete. The Facilitation/Recorder Team that she trains, coaches and mentors will continue to support the Commission both in Learning Conversations and developing the scopes of work for new funded partners. The team wants to contribute by making all First 5 meeting processes (Learning Conversations, planning, CHI) easier.

There is a Focused Conversation training session scheduled for May 18. She will look to recruit a couple new members to their team as a result of the training. The team itself is self-directed and meets quarterly. Nancy sends out the Learning Conversation schedule, and then the team members sign up. If a member of the team cannot make it, they do not call Nancy - they call another team member to get a replacement. It seems to be a sustainable model. They have been really enjoying facilitating the Learning Conversations and all the things that have been required this year. She shares that they appreciate the opportunity and that while they are contributing to the success of First 5 – Placer, they also personally learn a lot through their work with First 5.

2. During the December Commission meeting there was discussion regarding a request that all new funded partners be required to share lists of 0-5 clients served in their programs. This is an opportunity to continue that discussion so that staff and legal counsel will know if the Commission desires this and why. What are the questions to which the Commission requires answers?

Discussion:

Sandra - Going back to when we were working on finalizing the Request for Results, we entered this discussion on whether or not we should be collecting data on who our partners are seeing in some type a shared way. In terms of evaluation, how do we know throughout the county that we are making a difference? Do we collect data demographically from each partner? It could be that they are all seeing the same people.

Dr. Burton - From the HHS standpoint, it is understandable that we get people, in the community, asking us how do you know that HHS is not seeing the same people, the same families that are seen in the Children System of Care or in the Mental Health

system or receiving substance abuse services? Is it a small set of people who are using all of these services? A couple of years ago, HHS instituted some systems that are able to capture any duplication that is entered during the intake process. In the last twelve months, over 50,000 Placer County residences have been seen through HHS services. It is meaningful to HHS to know the services are provided across the county.

Christa - What came out of that meeting in December, was that there are legal problems that we have to overcome in order to start collecting this data. We need to know more information about what the goals are and an official approach to capturing this data. It is one thing to have the County collect informational data about the people seen in a County program. When funding non-County applicants those entities will have different types of limitations on what kind of information they can share and what type of people they provide services to. Issues arise such as limitations on minors. If it is the goal of the Commission to embark on this path, then the first thing as a group is to identify what information we want to collect and evaluate. From there, we will need to research what we will need as a possible tool. We can explore adding this into our contract. She will need formal direction from the Commission to start this research.

Elaine – Clarifies that since this was not part of the Request for Results that an application would not be denied due to lack of this information.

Don - The application would not be denied however, the applicant has to provide us demographic information and outcome information once a contract is signed. Also, in the contract itself we have provisions for client confidentiality.

Sandra – Suggests that this is to be a formal Commission action item and that we put it on our agenda for the upcoming Commission retreat. Overall, throughout the County, should we be collecting data from each partner on who they are seeing? What information do we want to evaluate? We really need to get clear on what we want to get out of it, what data is needed.

Dr. Burton - It would be great to have this data collection be part of the First 5 plan and in our contracts. It is easier to start with the new contracts. There is more to look into as far as the local court order which is the policy that SMART works under that allows for data collection and sharing. It is good to take time now to be clear on what we want to achieve and make it part of our new contracts.

Motion to further discuss this issue and add it to the agenda at the upcoming Commission Retreat in May 2007.

Unanimous

V. Commissioner Reports:

Elaine- Compliments the First 5 team on detailed meeting minutes from January.

Catherine – Noted that the Request for Results application process seemed to be an extension of the Open Space process that was used at the Applicant Workshop. Even though not everyone can be funded, she thinks great things will come from the process in the fact that it was so open. Connections have already been made from the application process and some people expressed that they are excited about learning what others are doing and working with them more closely in the future.

Jim - March 21st. A series of continuing drug abuse forums will be taking place. A meth awareness forum will be held, at the Parkside Church, in Auburn from 6-8 pm. We have flyers in all the schools promoting the forum. The last meth awareness forum took place, in Lincoln, in which over one hundred people attended. There is a meth awareness DVD available.

Dayle - Please note, in the approved January 11, 2007 minutes, that she is not actually on the Application Review Committee. The next CHI meeting will be the first actual local coalition meeting that will be held on March 21st. at 9:30 in the First 5 Enterprise office.

Melanie – Brought the Commission up to date with the Application Review Committee Team. The process has been unique. Everyone has been working hard and all the applicants thus far have been very cooperative. We should be proud of all the wonderful programs that this county has to offer for 0-5. They are rich and broad. We have passionate people doing these programs.

As of today, we have spoken with all applicants. They have had their audience and have been heard. Some are coming back Friday morning for final clarifications. On Friday, March 9th, initial funding recommendations will be given to the applicants. She expressed that it feels as though it is an extension of the Partner Network Outcome Faire. She can see the strategic plan coming about. The Review Team is honoring the strategic plan in the questions that are being asked of the applicants. A thank you to Don, Nancy and Sandy for supporting the application review team. It has been a great process.

Don - 1) Senate Bill 893 was introduced by Senator Cox. The bill will abolish First 5 and give Proposition 10 funding to child health services. The First 5 Association is tracking the bill and Don will update the Commission as to its progress. 2) One of the criticisms we've had of ourselves is that we do not promote the work of the Commission very well. Don made contact with Anne Staines of ProProse, the firm that the County contracted with to support the Mental Services Act public awareness. They call it social marketing which is very similar to our social capital theme. ProProse likes First 5 and thinks that they can assist us with promoting the Commission's work in the community. Anne will develop a proposal and Don will bring it back to the Commission via the Executive Committee.

Dr. Burton – Encourages Don to look at the scope of work in the County contract with ProProse as there may be overlaps or ways to coordinate activities.

Dr. Burton - Honors Nancy Baggett by presenting her with her ten year service award with Placer County. He mentions that Nancy was one of the first persons that he met when starting at HHS. She brings all of her skills, wisdom and experience to the Commission.

Nancy - Thank you for the ten-year service award.

We heard from several people that made great connections through the applicant workshop. They said it was a wonderful process. Some met people who shared similar goals and then realized that they do not need to request First 5 funding – they just need to collaborate with those who are already funded.. We heard this from many non profit agencies and from private for profit groups.

Two extra application binders have been made, if any of the Commissioners have a desire to look at any of the applications. The binders will be kept at the Enterprise office and managed by Sandy. If you would like to look at the binders, have any concerns, or if there is something you would like to know about ahead of time, please let her know, the binders are available. Sandy can be reached by phone at 530.886.1869.

Sandra – It has been very valuable having Heidi facilitate the application review process and to have Judy provide recording services. Nancy has been very valuable with bringing the staff perspective. The review committee is doing a great job. There were twenty-nine applications. There were really good strategies this time around. We are learning a lot. Each of the discussions with the applicants has been very informative. There are more requests for money than there is funding, a two million dollar difference. The recommendation process was difficult because all of the programs were good ones. There was no fluff; all were designed with the best interests of the children in mind. We should be proud of all the applicants representing 0-5. We have passionate people doing these projects.

At our next Commission meeting, in April we will present our final funding recommendations.

Meeting Adjourned: 6:06 pm

For more information concerning items on this agenda contact Don Ferretti, Director for the First 5 Placer - Children and Families Commission at 530.886.1824 or dferrett@placer.ca.gov.

